

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the non-final Office Action of June 2, 2006 in which claims 1-34 were rejected.

In Section 5, claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In Section 6, claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kalke, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0137890 (hereinafter Kalke) in view of Martin, JR. et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0023849 (hereinafter Martin, JR.).

Per a telephone conversation with the Examiner on June 22, 2006, the Applicant was asked to submit the agenda for a requested interview. The Applicant sent a FAX to the Examiner the same day comprising the following:

"The main goal of this interview is to discuss an RCE 1st office action of June 2, 2006. The Applicant introduced two limitations in the independent claims (e.g., claim 1) which was agreed upon during a telephone interview of March 7, 2006. However, the Examiner rejected the claims using the same rejections as in the final OA of February 3, 2006.

In the Interview summary of the March 7 interview, the Examiner stated that "Applicant clarified the differences between sending and forwarding the access-request by the terminal in the claim 1, yet the Examiner repeated 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection stating

again that the term "forwarding" is unclear. Explanations are requested.

Furthermore, each of the two limitations mentioned above was enough to overcome the obviousness rejection per 35 USC 103(a); thus even if the Applicant only introduced the limitation stating that a well-known uniform resource locator is associated with the help-portal server, that would be enough to overcome the prior art quoted by the Examiner (since none of the references described this limitation). Why is this obviousness rejection repeated again? Explanations are requested.

Furthermore, during today's brief telephone conversation, the Examiner stated that the second limitation introduced in the independent claims regarding chain of trust is not detailed enough. First, the Applicant is of the opinion that this limitation should not be even added, because the first limitation is enough to distinguish from the prior art quoted by the Examiner, and the Applicant agreed to add this limitation for a clarification purpose only. But anyway, this limitation does not read into the prior art of Martin et al. as alleged by the Examiner. Martin et al. disclose delegation of authority of the trusted provisioning domains from one to another domain outside of network 3 as shown in figure 1 of Martin et al. In the present patent application, the chain of trust is established by the network and within the network and communicated to the terminal through consecutive exchange of information between the network and the terminal: none of these limitations are disclosed by Martin et al. Explanations are requested."

In response to this FAX, the Examiner called the Applicant on June 27, 2006 and stated that the arguments presented in the FAX quoted above are convincing and that the claim amendment submitted to the USPTO on March 13, 2006 is accepted by the Examiner for obviating the above rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In the Amendment B submitted in this communication with the USPTO Office, various of the previously presented claims are changed in ways believed related only to matters of form. In particular, "characterized by/in that" is replaced with "comprising/wherein." Applicant respectfully submits that such changes are permissible per MPEP § 2111.03 (the transitional term "comprising" is synonymous with "characterized by"). Furthermore, reference numerals/labels are removed from the claims, which change does not affect the scope of the claims per MPEP § 608.01(m) which states that "The use of reference characters is considered as having no effect on the scope of the claims". Also the preamble in claim 1 is incorporated as a "wherein" statement. Finally, the claims are amended to remove "step of" language.

In addition, claim 35 is amended to be of similar scope as claim 1 and further apparatus claims 35-37, having similar scope as claims 1 and 2, respectively, are added. The amended and new claims 34-37 do not add new matter and should be allowed as long as corresponding claims 1 and 2 are allowed.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of June 2, 2006 having been obviated and shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of all claims to issue is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Anatoly Frenkel
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 54,106

AZF/mef
July 7, 2006
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234